Measures, Indicators, and Improvement of Quality of Life in Nursing Homes: Final Report: Volume 1

Submitted to Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services
by Division for Health Services Research and Policy,
School of Public Health, University of Minnesota
Rosalie A. Kane, Principal Investigator
Mary Pratt, Project Officer
Karen Schoeneman, Associate Project Officer

June 2004

Researchers

University of Minnesota
Rosalie A. Kane, PhD
Robert L. Kane, MD
Boris Bershadsky, PhD
Lois J. Cutler, PhD
Katherine Giles, MS, MSN
Research Assistants: Jiexin AJason@ Liu, Kyoungrae Kang, Lixin Zhang

St. Cloud State University
Kristen C. Kling, PhD

University of Pittsburgh
Howard B. Degenholtz, PhD

This report is a product of the project: *Measures, Indicators, and Improvement of Quality of Life in Nursing Homes* (RFP: HCFA-98-002/PK), which was conducted from May 1, 1998 to July 31, 2003 under Master Contract # 500-96-0008 between the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) and the University of Minnesota. Robert L. Kane is the director of the Master Contract, and Rosalie A. Kane, the project director. The views in the report are those of the researchers and not necessarily those of CMS or the project officers. M. Powell Lawton, PhD, Philadelphia Geriatric Center contributed to greatly to this work and was a co-author of early interim reports before his death in 2001. An draft version was submitted to CMS in march 2004, and this revision responds to CMS comments.

For more information, contact Rosalie A. Kane at the Division of Health Services Research & Policy, School of Public Health, University of Minnesota, 420 Delaware St., SE, MMC 197, D-527 Mayo Building, Minneapolis, MN 55455, phone 612-624-5171, fax 612-634-5434, and email, kanex002@umn.edu.

Preface

In 1998, the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS), then the Health Care Financing Administration) contracted with the University of Minnesota to perform work in a project called: *Measures, Indicators, and Improvement of Quality of Life in Nursing Homes.* The project's major objectives were twofold: 1) develop and test measures and indicators of quality of life in nursing homes; and 2) study how the physical environments in nursing homes affect that quality of life.

Each major objective entailed many specific tasks and analyses, and two waves of large-scale data collection were conducted to develop and test the quality of life measures themselves. The purpose of this report is to gather in a single report a description of all the methods and results from this multifaceted 5-year study.

The authors are indebted to the project officer, Mary Pratt, for her unfailing helpfulness during this study, as well as to Karen Schoeneman, who served as an additional project officer with special emphasis on the applicability of the work to the nursing home survey and certification process. As always, the conclusions are not necessarily those of CMS or its project officers.

The authors also acknowledge the extraordinary contributions of M. Powell Lawton, PhD Philadelphia Geriatric Center, who worked on this project from its inception. His untimely death in January 2001 prevented most of the results and interpretations presented here to be informed by his involvement.

Rosalie A. Kane, PhD
Division of Health Services Research & Policy
School of Public Health
University of Minnesota
June 2004

Table of Contents

Volume 1

Executive Summary E1
Introduction E1
Field work methods E2
Wave 1 ..... E3
Wave 2 ..... E5
Transferability study E6
Data collection procedures E7
Resident self-report measures E7
Family and staff proxies for resident QOL E7
Resident personality E14
Facility-level QOL data E15
Shortened QOL screeners E17
Facility level protocols to observe staff and resident interactions E18
On-site potential indicators E22
Off-site external indicators E23
Transferability E24
Physical environments E26
Conclusions, Implications, and Recommendation E27

Chapter 1: Introduction 1.1
General objectives…… 1.1
Scope and significance…… 1.1
Why focus on QOL…… 1.1
Significance of environmental studies 1.3
Expected users of QOL measures and indicators……..... 1.4
Survey and certification personnel 1.5
Providers 1.6
Consumers, consumer advocates, and purchasers 1.6
Other group care settings 1.6
Assumptions 1.7
Emphasis on psychological and social components of QOL 1.7
Inclusions and exclusions of residents 1.7
Exclusions of facilities 1.8
Residents as gold standard 1.8
Need to supplement resident self-report 1.9
Multiple sources of information 1.9
Dimensionality of QOL 1.9
Measures and indicators defined 1.10
Organization of the report 1.11
References 1.14

Chapter 2: General methods 2.1
Develop and test measures and indicators 2.1
Research tasks and questions 2.1
Two waves of data collection strategy 2.2
Wave 1 ..... 2.2
Interim data collection 2.4
Wave 2 data collection 2.4

Transferability study 2.5
Environmental Study 2.6
Research tasks and questions 2.6
Data collection 2.6
Procedures: Wave 1 ..... 2.7
Selection of states 2.7
Survey of facilities in catchment areas 2.8
Selection of facilities 2.11
Recruitment of facilities 2.12
Selection of units within nursing homes 2.14
Selection of residents 2.15
Tracking system 2.17
Logistics 2.19
Hiring interviewers 2.20
Training 2.21
On-site data collection procedures 2.23
Reliability testing 2.24
Test-retest of resident Interview 2.24
Inter-staff reliability 2.24
Inter-observer reliability on room and bath protocol 2.25
Inter-observer reliability on facility-wide observations 2.25
Environmental facility-wide assessments and on-site indicators 2.25
Procedures: Wave 2 ..... 2.26

Chapter 3: Developing and testing resident-reported quality of life measures 3.1
Background 3.1
QOL measurement in general 3.1
QOL Measurement for older people 3.2
QOL for nursing home residents 3.4
Identifying QOL domains 3.7
Approach 3.7
Domain selection 3.8
Further Review of existing measures 3.9
Comments about Existing Tools 3.12
Measurement Development: Wave 1 ..... 3.13
Questionnaire 3.13
Emotional well-being 3.14
Satisfaction 3.14
Summary ratings 3.15
Data Collection 3.15
Wave 1 Findings 3.15
Developing a scoring system 3.15
Validation and item reduction 3.17
Responses rates: Wave 1 ..... 3.20
Alpha reliabilities for longer scales: Wave 1 ..... 3.22
Residents with lower cognitive functioning 3.22
Long scales: Correlations among domains 3.24
Shorter Scales: Wave 1 ..... 3.27
Summary of Wave 1 findings 3.36
Wave 2 findings 3.38
Conclusions from Wave 2 ..... 3.44
References 3.45
Chapter 4: Family and line staff proxies for resident reported quality of life 4.1

Background 4.1
Methods 4.10
Sample 4.10
Family sample and data collection 4.10
Staff sample and data collection 4.10
Instruments 4.11
Statistical Analysis 4.11
Results 4.12
Discussion 4.19
References 4.22

Chapter 5: Personality and quality of life 5.1
Development of the measures 5.2
Approach 5.2
Pilot Study 5.3
Wave 2 large-scale application 5.6
Relationship between QOL and personality 5.10
Areas for continued investigation 5.11
Concluding comments 5.12
References 5.13

Chapter 6: Patterns of quality of life in facilities 6.1
Background 6.1
Methods 6.3
Data 6.3
Analysis 6.4
Results 6.5
Wave 1 ..... 6.5
Wave 2 findings 6.12
Facility effect size 6.15
Discussion 6.17
References 6.20

Chapter 7: Development of short quality of life screeners 7.1
Issues 7.1
Data collection circumstances 7.1
Response formats 7.2
Summary of Shortened Scales 7.5
34-item and 14-item multidimensional instruments 7.8
Goal 7.8
Step 1. Develop brief multidimensional instrument using Likert and interpolated binary responses 7.8
Step 2. Test the local optimality (goodness) of the obtained instrument using the same sample 7.10
Step 3. Test the 34-item instrument using a larger sample 7.11
Step 4. Test the dichotomized instrument using the large scale (1219 Cases) 7.11
Step 5. Test discriminative power of the original and dichotomized domain scores 7.14
Step 6. Test the Dimensional Structure of QOL-MD14 using the large sample 7.14

Developing a Short Uni-Dimensional QOL Scale 7.17
Goal 7.17
Approach 7.18
Results 7.22
Adding Dignity: QOL-16 ..... 7.25
Discussion 7.26

Chapter 8: Facility-wide observational approaches 8.1
Approach 8.1
Wave 1 Protocols 8.2
Measures 8.2
Data collection 8.3
Wave 2 protocols 8.4
Transferability 8.5
Analyses 8.6
Scale-Level Results 8.7
Wave 1 Frequencies 8.7
Wave 1 Scale-Level Analysis 8.10
Streamlining the Tool for Wave 2 ..... 8.12
Item-level analyses 8.13
Combined-items analyses 8.13
Wave 2 Frequencies 8.15
Results of Scale-Level Analyses, Wave 2 ..... 8.16
Transferability Study Changes 8.17
Transferability Study Frequencies 8.18
Transferability Study Scale Results 8.19
Cross Administration Item Analysis 8.20
Discrimination of Observation Items across Facilities 8.23
Conclusions 8.28

Chapter 9. Potential QOL indicators from on-site data collection 9.1
Methods 9.1
Data collection 9.1
Wave 1 ..... 9.1
Wave 2 ..... 9.3
Data Elements 9.3
Wave 1 ..... 9.3
Wave 2 ..... 9.6
Analysis 9.6
Data collection and sample 9.7
Descriptive findings 9.7

Chapter 10: **Relationship of quality of life and indicators from extant data** 10.1
Variables 10.1
Resident Factors from MDS Data 10.1
Nursing Home Quality Indicators from MDS Data 10.2
Facility Factors from OSCAR Data 10.2
Deficiencies Related to QOL from Survey 10.3
Analysis 10.4
Findings 10.5
Conclusions 10.11
References 10.13

Chapter 11: Transferability of quality of life data collection 11.1
Transferability to facility staff 11.2
Theoretical considerations 11.2
Methods 11.3
Research questions 11.3
Sample 11.4
Procedures 11.5
Data analysis 11.6
Compliance with training 11.6
Results of QOL interviews: staff 11.7
Results of facility level observations: staff 11.13
Surveyors Results 11.25
Results on Resident Interviews: Surveyors 11.25
Results on Observations: Surveyors 11.30
Qualitative results 11.33
Training 11.33
Reactions to doing interview 11.33
Reactions to observations 11.34
Logistics 11.35
Conclusions 11.35

Chapter 12: Physical environments and their relationship to quality of life 12.1
Background 12.1
Theoretical framework 12.2
Environmental measurement in nursing homes 12.5
Development of environmental checklists 12.8
Instrument development 12.8
Data collection 12.10
Analysis 12.12
Descriptive findings 12.14
Composite indices 12.16
Room and bath composite indices 12.22
Unit composite indices 12.24
Facility composite indices 12.27
Lighting 12.28
Developing a Typology of Nursing Home Environments 12.31
Cluster Analysis 12.31
Facility Variables 12.32
Unit Variables 12.32
Room Variables 12.33
Determination of the Number of Clusters 12.33
Cluster 1 ..... 12.41
Cluster 2 ..... 12.42
Cluster 3 ..... 12.42
Cluster 4 ..... 12.43
Cluster 5 ..... 12.43
Cluster 6 ..... 12.44
QOL and cluster membership 12.44
Summary and next steps for cluster analysis 12.45
Privacy 12.46
Discussion 12.48
References 12.50

Chapter 13: Conclusions, Implications, and Recommendations…… 13.1
Summary of major findings…… 13.1
Implications …… 14.14

Tables and Figures

Figure 2.1. Cognition Measure used for Sampling Residents....2.16
Figure 2.2. Algorithm for selecting residents for the sample in each facility....2.18
Table 2.1. Comparison of Wave 1 and Wave 2....2.3
Table 2.2. QOL Facility Survey Results. 2.10
Table 2.3. Distribution of NH in Sample by State and Number of Units....2.15

Figure 3.1. Domain loadings on overall QOL based on the second order confirmatory factor analysis of the short scales 3.29
Figure 3.2. Confirmatory Factor Analysis, Wave 2. 11 Domains with cases who answered all 53 questions (959 cases)....3.42
Table 3.1. Specification of QOL Domains....3.11

Table 3.2. Number of Items Per Long Domain Scale....3.18
Table 3.3. Distribution of Cognitive Scores in Overall Sample....3.19
Table 3.4. Description of Sample by Scale Completion for Long Scales (in Percents) 3.21
Table 3.5. Long Scales: Scale Reliability by Cognition Level....3.22
Table 3.6 Percent of Useful Respondents by Different Completeness Rules....3.23
Table 3.7. Long Scales: Mean Z-Scores of Residents by Cognition....3.24
Table 3.8. Summary Score Correlations for Individual Residents 3.25
Table 3.9. Regressions to Predict Scale Scores Using Domain Summary Items....3.26
Table 3.10. Long Scales: Regression of Domains with "Life as a Whole" by Cognitive Status 3.27
Table 3.11. Standardized Regression Coefficients of Observed Variables on Latent QOL Factors....3.30
Table 3.12. Reliability of Domain Scores by Cognitive Function....3.33
Table 3.13. Correlations Among Domain Scores for Short Wave 1 Scales 3.34
Table 3.14. Correlations Between QOL Scales and Emotions by Cognition Group....3.35
Table 3.15. Correlations Between QOL Scales and Global Satisfaction by Cognition Group 3.36
Table 3.16. Characteristics of Wave 2 Sample....3.40
Table 3.17. Correlations among domains: Wave 2 ....3.41
Table 3.18. Regression to Predict Scale Wave 2 Scores Using Summary Items for the Domains....3.43

Table 4.1. Studies Evaluating Proxies for QOL Measures....4.4
Table 4.2 Comparison of Mean QOL Values by Respondent Group....4.12
Table 4.3 Correlations Between Resident and Staff Proxies....4.13
Table 4.4 Correlations Between Resident and Family Proxies 4.14
Table 4.5 Correlations Between Proxies and Residents for Summary Items 4.15
Table 4.6 Correlations Between Proxies and Residents for Emotion Items....4.16
Table 4.7 Regression Coefficients for Resident Ratings by Domain: Residents Vs. Staff....4.17
Table 4.8. Resident Coefficients for Resident Ratings by Domain: Residents Vs. Family …… 4.18

Table 4.9 Correlations of Facility Level Domain Scores between Residents and Proxies....4.19

Table 5.1 Descriptive Statistics and Factor Analysis Results for the Original BFI....5.4
Table 5.2 Scale Qualities for 27-item Version of the BFI....5.6
Table 5.3 Percentage of Respondents Choosing Likert-type Responses by Cognition....5.8
Table 5.4 Descriptive Statistics and Factor Analysis Results for the 25-item BFI in Wave 2....5.9
Table 5.5 Scale Qualities for 25-item Version of the BFI....5.9
Table 5.6 Regression results prediction QOL using cognitive and physical functioning and personality....5.10

Table 6.1 Wave 1 Facility Characteristics (N=40)....6.6
Table 6.2 QOL Domain Alpha Values and Facility Scores....6.7
Table 6.3 Facility-Level Deviations in Resident-Report QOL (Risk-Adjusted)....6.8
Table 6.4 Ability of Various Components of QOL to Differentiate Facilities (Non-Adjusted and Adjusted for Residents' Characteristics)....6.10
Table 6.5 Ability of Various Components of QOL to Differentiate Facilities (Adjusted for Residents' Characteristics and Allocation of Interviewers)....6.11
Table 6.6 Effect of Length of NH Stay on Domain Scores at Wave1....6.12
Table 6.7 Wave 2 Facility Characteristics....6.12
Table 6.8 Facility Risk-adjusted Performance Summary atWave2....6.13
Table 6.9 Effect of Length of NH Stay on Domain Scores–Wave 2....6.15
Table 6.10 Sample Size Needed to Detect A Mean Difference Across Facilities: Equal to Different Levels of Between-Groups Standard Deviation at Wave 1....6.16
Table 6.11 Sample Size Needed to Detect a Mean Difference Across Facilities: Equal to Different Levels of Between-Groups Standard Deviation at Wave 2....6.17

Figure 7.1 Facility Average QOL-14 Scores (Wave 2)....7.24
Table 7.1 Domain Structure of Three Shortened Scales....7.6
Table 7.2 Comparison of Items in 3 Shortened QOL Scales....7.7
Table 7.3 Factor analysis for 955 Wave 2 Cases for Likert Responses with no Missing Items....7.9
Table 7.4 Factor Analysis of Wave 2 Data Interpolating Binary with Likert Responses for 1292 Cases....7.12
Table 7.5 Factor Analysis of Wave 2 Data with "Dichotomization" of Likert Items for 1291 Cases....7.13
Table 7.6 Mixed-Effect Model....7.15
Table 7.7 Dimensional Structure of 14-Item 4-Factor Scale (QOL-MD14) With Dichotomized Responses....7.16
Table 7.8 Number of Homogeneous Subgroups for each Domain at each wave....7.19
Table 7.9 Items in the QOL-14....7.21
Table 7.10 Properties of Scale Versions at Wave 1 and Wave 2....7.23
Table 7.11 Correlations of QOL-14 with QOL-MD14....7.23
Table 7.12 Correlations of New Scales with Original. Domain Scores....7.24
Table 7.13 Distribution of Facility Average QOL-14 Scores....7.25

Figure 8.1 Items Correlated with Overall QOL in each Wave 1 Observation

Context 8.13
Table 8.1 Frequency of Observed Items during Meals at Wave 1 ..... 8.7
Table 8.2 Frequency of Observed Items during Activities at Wave 1 ..... 8.8
Table 8.3 Frequency of Observed Items during Walkthroughs at Wave 1 ..... 8.9
Table 8.4 Relationship between Negative Observations and QOL by Domain in Wave 1 ..... 8.10
Table 8.5 Relationship between Positive Observations and QOL by Domain in Wave 1 ..... 8.11
Table 8.6 Correlation between Overall Behavior Counts and QOL Scores for 11 Domains 8.11
Table 8.7 Frequency of Items Observed at Wave 2 ..... 8.16
Table 8.8 Correlations Between Behavior Counts and Adjusted QOL Scores 8.17
Table 8.9 Frequency of Researcher Observations in Transferability Study 8.18
Table 8.10 Frequency of Researcher Observations during Transferability Study Walkthroughs 8.19
Table 8.11 Correlation Between Behavior Counts and Un-adjusted QOL Scores 8.20
Table 8.12 Summary of Item Behavior in Predicting QOL Across Assessments 8.21
Table 8.13 Results of One-Way ANOVAs for the Meal Observation in Wave-1 ..... 8.23
Table 8.14 Results of One-Way ANOVAs for the Activity Observation in Wave-1 ..... 8.24
Table 8.15 Results of One-Way ANOVAs for the Walkthrough Observation in Wave 1 ..... 8.25
Table 8.16 Results of One-Way ANOVAs for Facility Observations in Wave 2 ..... 8.27
Table 8.17 Deviation Scores Across All Items for the Meal Observation in Wave 1 ..... 8.29

Table 9.1. Frequencies for On-site Indicators and Comments, Wave 1 ..... 9.11
Table 9.2. Frequencies for On-site Indicators and Comments, Wave 2 ..... 9.14
Table 9.3. Frequencies for On-site Indicators and Comments, Waves 1 and 2 Combined 9.16
Table 9.4. Variables Studied at Wave 1 and their Significant Relationships to QOL 9.18
Table 9.5. Indicators Significantly Related to Individual Domains, Wave 1 ..... 9.20
Table 9.6. Variables Studied at Wave 2 and Their Significant Relationships to QOL 9.23
Table 9.7. Indicators Significantly Related to Individual Domains, Wave 2 ..... 9.25
Table 9.8. Variables Combined from Waves 1 and 2 & their Relationships to QOL 9.27
Table 9.9. Indicators That Significantly Influence Individual QOL Domains, Waves 1 & 2 ..... 9.28
Table 9.10. Relationship of Indicators to Facility Overall QOL, Wave 1 Data Only…. 9.30
Table 9.11. Relationship of Indicators to Overall Facility QOL, Wave 2 Data Only……9.31
Table 9.12. Relationship of Indicators to Overall Facility QOL, Waves 1 and 2 Data…. 9.32

Figure 10.1 Citations Related to QOL 10.4
Table 10.1 Association Between Quality of Life and Resident Characteristics 10.7
Table 10.2 Association Between Quality of Life and Quality of Care Indicators 10.8
Table 10.3 Association Between Quality of Life and Nursing Home Personnel 10.10
Table 10.4 Association between Quality of Life and Number of Citations 10.13

Table 11.1 Use of Likert Responses and Missing Responses by Discipline and Training Mode 11.7
Table 11.2 Mean QOL Scores for Researcher and Nursing Home Staff Interviewers 11.8
Table 11.3 Correlations of Nursing Home Staff and Researchers Interview Data 11.10
Table 11.4 Correlations Between Researcher and Staff Interviewers by Domain Scores 11.11
Table 11.5 Mean Differences Between Interviewers by Domain Scores 11.12
Table 11.6 Mean Values of Domain Scores by Nursing Home Staff Characteristics 11.13
Table 11.7 Mean Meal Observation Scores for Researchers and Nursing Home Staff 11.14
Table 11.8 Mean Meal Observation Scores for Staff and Researchers by Training Mode 11.15
Table 11.9 Mean Meal Observation Scores for Staff and Researchers by Staff Profession 11.17
Table 11.10 Extent of Agreement on Meal Observations Between Researchers and Staff 11.18
Table 11.11 Effect of Training Mode and Profession on the Extent of Agreement on Meal Observations Between Researchers and Staff 11.18
Table 11.12 Differences in Mean Ratings of Walkthrough Observations Between Researchers and Staff 11.19
Table 11.13 Mean Ratings of Walkthrough Observations by Training 11.20
Table 11.14 Mean Ratings of Walkthrough Observations by Education 11.22
Table 11.15 Extent of Concordance between Nursing Home Staff Observers and Research Observers for Walkthrough Observations 11.23

Table 11.16 Extent of Concordance between Nursing Home Staff Observers & Research Observers for Walkthrough by Training and Profession 11.24
Table 11.17 Mean Values for Interview Questions for Researchers and Surveyors 11.26
Table 11.18 Mean Domain Scores for Researchers and Surveyors 11.27
Table 11.19 Level of Agreement for QOL Questions between Research Interviewers and Surveyors 11.28
Table 11.20 Correlations Between Surveyors and Researchers by Domain Scores 11.29
Table 11.21 Mean Values of Meal Observations for Surveyors and Researchers 11.30
Table 11.22 Mean Values of Walkthrough Observations for Surveyors and Researchers 11.31
Table 11.23 Correlations between Surveyors and Researchers on Meal Observations 11.32
Table 11.24 Correlations between Researchers and Surveyors on Walkthrough Observations 11.32

Table 12.1 Composite Index Characteristics at 3 Levels 12.17

Table 12.2. Composite Indices and Frequency of Index Items at the Room Level 12.18
Table 12.3. Composite Indices and Frequency of Index Items at the Unit Level 12.19
Table 12.4. Composite Indices and Frequency of Index Items at the Facility Level 12.21
Table 12.5. One-Way ANOVA on Composite Scale Mean Differences Between Room Types 12.24
Table 12.6 Light Levels 12.29
Table 12.7 Distribution of Clusters 12.34
Table 12.8 Descriptive Statistics for Clusters 12.34
Table 12.9 Internal Facility Attributes Associated With Cluster Membership 12.36
Table 12.10 Internal Unit Attributes Associated with Cluster Membership 12.38
Table 12.11 Internal Room Attributes Associated With Cluster Membership 12.40
Table 12.12 Average QOL by Cluster 12.45
Table 12.13 Prevalence of Private Rooms and Number of Roommates 12.47
Table 12.14 Effect of Private Room and Number of Roommates on QOL 12.48

Volume 2
Appendices

Wave 1 Material

A. Survey of Facilities in Wave 1 Catchment Areas
B. Resident Interview, Wave 1
C. Staff Interview about Resident and Staff Contact Form
D. Family Questionnaire about Resident and Family Contact Form
E. Resident-Level Protocol for Observation of Resident Affect
F. Facility-Level Observation of Resident and Staff Interactions, Wave 1
G. Environmental Checklist: Room and Bath
H. Environmental Checklist: Nursing Unit
I. Environmental Checklist: Facility Level
J. Administrative Interview and Archival Information
K. Nursing Interview
L. Social Work Interview
M. Activities Interview
N. Summary Indicator Document
O. Overall Interviewer Rating

Wave 2 Materials

P. Resident Interview, Wave 2
Q. Observation of Staff and Resident Interactions, Wave 2
R. Administrative Questionnaire, Wave 2
S. QOL Scales Scoring Document

Transferability Materials

T. Resident Interview for the Transferability Study
U. Observation of Resident and Staff Interactions for the Transferability Study
V. Training Material for Transferability Observations
W. Focus Group Guide

Other

X. Published articles from QOL project

Kane, RA. (2003). Definition, Measurement, and Correlates of Quality of Life in Nursing Homes: Towards a Reasonable Practice, Research, and Policy Agenda. *The Gerontologist*, 43 (Special Edition II), 28-36.

Kane, RA., Kling, KC., Bershadsky, B., Kane, RL., Giles, K., Degenholtz, HB., Liu, J. & Cutler, LJ. (2003). Quality of life measures for nursing home residents. *Journal of Gerontology: Medical Sciences*, 58A (3), 240-248.